

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/092,095	03/06/2002	Brian Bates	8627-051 8504			
7590 08/18/2004			EXAMINER			
J. Matthew Bu		WEBB, SARAH K				
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. Box 10395			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Chicago, IL 60610			3731			
_				DATE MAILED: 00/10/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No).	Applicant(s)	UM				
Office Action Summary		10/092,095		BATES, BRIAN					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Sarah K Webb		3731					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cove	er sheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we preceived by the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, how within the statutory movill apply and will expire, cause the application	vever, may a reply be tim inimum of thirty (30) days e SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ju	une 2002.							
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from conside							
Applicat	ion Papers								
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b)□ ot drawing(s) be hel tion is required if t	d in abeyance. See he drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF					
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) <u></u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been red s have been red rity documents h u (PCT Rule 17.	ceived. ceived in Applicati nave been receive 2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachmer	• •								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	•					
3) 🛛 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/02.	· =	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/092,095

Art Unit: 3731

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 1. Claims 1,2,4-8,10-13,18,19,21,22,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,231,597 to Deem et al.

See Figures 4 and 11A. The support frame (14) of the stent is a single wire, as most clearly seen in Figure 1. The term "substantially" was given the broadest reasonable interpretation. The circumference of the stent of Deem is considered to have a "substantially uniform circumference." The circumference of a device is determined by its radius, and the radius of the Deem stent does not vary over its length. A graft material (104) is disposed on a portion of the support frame and only extends over approximately half the circumference of the stent. Deem explains that the material (104) is formed of typical graft material, such as PTFE and is attached by means such as adhesives (column 5, lines 45-55). Regarding claim 6, some of the adjacent curved regions located at each end of the stent extend beyond each other. The term

"interleaved" in claim 18 does not require the curved regions to extend beyond one another.

Regarding the limitation "formed from a pattern in a sheet" in claims 7 and 21, this is only a product by process recitation. Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. Therefore, the limitation was not given patentable weight.

2. Claims 1-4,7,9,28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,036,725 to Avellanet.

Avellanet discloses a stent in Figure 1 that includes a single wire support frame (30). Graft material (16) is disposed about a portion of the circumference. Avellanet explains that portions (16) include graft material, such as PTFE (column 6, lines 50-60). The stent can engage the entire inner circumference of a vessel. The graft material (16) extends only a portion of the length of the frame and about ½ the circumference. The device can be deployed with a balloon catheter (Fig. 22) and with a retractable sheath (44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/092,095

Art Unit: 3731

3. Claims 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deem in view of US Patent No. 6,080,191 to Summers.

Deem fails to form the support frame with a longitudinal support. Summers discloses a stent in Figure 1 that is similar in structure to the support frame of Deem. In Figure 21, Summers shows an alternate form of the stent with a longitudinal support. Both structure have ring segments joined by curved sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a longitudinal support in the frame of Deem, as Summers teaches that this is alternate form a stent that has ring segments joined by curved sections.

4. Claims 14,20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deem.

The graft of Deem extends half the circumference of the frame instead of only one-fourth the circumference. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to reduce the length of the graft around circumference of the frame, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deem in view of Summers.

The graft of Deem, as modified by Summers, extends half the circumference of the frame instead of only one-fourth the circumference. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to reduce the length of the graft around circumference of the frame, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a

Application/Control Number: 10/092,095

Art Unit: 3731

component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

6. Claims 15 – 17 and 25 –27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deem in view of US Patent No. 6,464,720 to Boatman et al.

Deem includes all the limitations of the claims, except for three radiopaque markers adjacent to the edge of the graft material. The edge of the graft material is at the edge of the stent frame, so radiopaque markers at the edge of the stent frame would meet this limitation. Boatman discloses a wire frame stent. Boatman teaches that it is particularly useful to have three radiopaque markers positioned at both the proximal and distal ends of the stent so that it can be clearly viewed to determine its exact location (column 19, lines 21-67). As shown in Figure 28, three radiopaque markers (102,103,104) are located at the edge of the stent frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include three radiopaque markers at the edge of the stent frame of Deem, as Boatman teaches that this arrangement of radiopaque markers aids in the determination of the exact location of the stent in the body.

7. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deem in view of Summers, as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Boatman. See rejection (6) above.

Art Unit: 3731

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah K Webb whose telephone number is (703) 605-1176. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, McDermott or Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-0858. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SKW 08/13/04

> JULIAN W. WOO PRIMARY EXAMINE

Julia W. Moo